

he must make them in this awesome context. I trust and I am confident that those of us with public responsibilities—in Government and out and especially the press and other news media—will remain cognizant of this burden during the next few months.

Let me set forth next my understanding of the position to which the Soviet Union adheres in the Berlin situation. It is, so far as I am aware, unchanged as is ours, except in time schedule since it was first announced in November 1958. I should like to state that position in substance without sensationalism and as objectively as I can delineate it from the accounts which have appeared in the press. The Soviet Union intends to withdraw from its World War II occupational responsibilities in East Berlin and it insists that the Western powers must do the same in West Berlin. It proposes to turn over East Berlin to the East German authorities, presumably as part of a separate peace treaty with the East German government. It offers to join in a guarantee of a new status for West Berlin as a free city within that state. And if I am not mistaken, Mr. Khrushchev has added to this position a further contention that the Soviet Union will come to the military aid of the East German authorities in the event that the Western Powers refuse to accept this change and continue to assert their present responsibilities in West Berlin in opposition to the wishes of those authorities.

These two positions, then, form the substance of the Berlin crisis now dormant but which, at any time, may become active. We insist, in effect, on the continuance of the status quo in Berlin for the present and, presumably until such time as Germany is unified. The Russians are intent upon changing the status quo in a particular fashion in the near future, regardless of the eventual solution of the question of German unification.

I know that we intend to maintain our position. I do not lightly assume that the Soviet Premier does not mean what he says with respect to the position of the Soviet Union, despite the postponements of the actual act of Soviet withdrawal during the months and years since November 1959.

My own view of this situation, however, is not one which depends on whether the Soviet Premier means what he says or does not mean what he says. It is based upon my personal estimate of the changing situation in Europe and the world and it is based upon what I believe to be the rational interests of this Nation in the light of those changes.

I have long questioned and I continue to question a status quo which places us in the position, in effect, of pleading with or urging the Russians not to withdraw their military forces from the westernmost point of penetration which they reached in Europe in the wake of World War II; yet, our present position on Berlin requires that we do precisely that. Further, Madam President, I do not think we can safeguard most effectively our own interests or advance the interests of peace when we insist upon remaining directly under a Communist sword of Damocles, as is now the case in Berlin. If a rational alternative may be found to that position through diplomacy. Further, I have long questioned and I continue to question a position on Berlin which was assumed immediately after World War II and has been maintained unchanged despite the enormous changes which have occurred in both parts of Germany and in Europe since that time.

Finally, I question, as I have long questioned, a position which, through subordinate irresponsibility, error or provocation on either side invites the precipitation of a nuclear conflict.

We prove our courage, our steadfastness, our determination when we insist, as insist we must with all that insistence implies,

that we shall not permit the Russians or anyone else to dictate unilaterally the terms under which this Nation and its allies shall discharge the responsibilities which were assumed in Berlin in the wake of World War II. We would prove little more than the inertia of Western leadership, however, if we insist that the status quo in Berlin is sacrosanct. We prove little more than the sterility of our diplomacy if we insist that the status quo at Berlin cannot be changed even by mutual agreement leading to a new situation, which is neither that which now exists nor the alternative which the Soviet Union propounds. It seems to me, Madam President, that if we are to be not merely courageous but intelligently courageous that is precisely the course we must pursue. We must seek a third way in Berlin which may better serve the interests of all the parties concerned—of the German people no less than other Europeans, of the United States no less than the Soviet Union, and of that great stretch of the world with its hundreds of millions of people to whom Berlin is but a name, if it is even that.

I would not wish to preclude, Madam President, any proposals to this end which may originate in any quarter. Indeed, it would be helpful, in my opinion, if the Senate discussed this matter at length. I suggest, moreover, that this discussion might profitably begin now before the relatively dormant crisis in Berlin comes alive once again. We can think now of its many implications with a measure of detachment and deliberation. If we wait for the moment of heat, it may be too late to think at all.

I repeat, Madam President, I do not wish to preclude any ideas or proposals, regardless of their source, which may promise a rational solution of the problem of Berlin. For my part, however, I believe that the third way lies in an honest recognition of the fact that it is too late in the game to expect that Germany will be reunified in peace by fiat of the United States, France, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia as was expected 15 years ago. Yet, this assumption continues to underlie our position with respect to Berlin. If the assumption is invalid, then the continued garrisoning of Berlin by the forces of these four nations loses much of its significance as a temporary occupational measure which was all it was intended to be when these garrisons were established a decade and a half ago.

However, Berlin—not only West Berlin, but all Berlin—does not lose its significance in terms of ultimate German unification. Berlin remains the symbolic hope of that unification and I do not think it is unreasonable to assume that it will one day again be the actual capital of a unified Germany. It seems to me that the German people will have the best opportunity to find the way to unification in peace and the outside powers will make a significant contribution to the search, if they will act now to remove Berlin—all Berlin—from the clashes of the cold war into which it has been driven by the events of the postwar years. If we must live, as it now seems likely, for an indefinite period with a divided Germany, then peace requires that Berlin—all Berlin—be held in peace and in trust until the day of unification. Its status must be reconstituted so that Berlin will be the hope for peaceful German unification rather than the prize for German unification by other means which it has now become.

This conversion of Berlin will not occur under Mr. Khrushchev's proposal to turn only West Berlin into a free city. Even if the rights of the Western presence to that half-city were insured beyond a shadow of doubt, even if guarantees of the safety of the Western enclave were inviolate, it does not seem to me that this arrangement would be satisfactory. For it would reduce this enclave to a sleepy quasi-foreign anachronism, and it

would leave Berlin—symbolic Berlin, unifying Berlin, Capital Berlin, German Berlin—in the hands of a militant German minority. It would give an enormous and inadmissible amplification throughout Germany to the present small voice of the East German minority government at Pankow. It would invite German nationalism throughout Germany to adhere to the German Communist standard flying in East Berlin. That is a handicap which freedom cannot allow. It is a concession which does not accord with the needs of peace in Germany or the essentials of peaceful competition between communism and freedom.

I do not believe, Madam President, that the way to peace can be found either in the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin or in the change which Mr. Khrushchev proposes. A third way may lie in the creation of a free city, not in West Berlin alone, but in the creation of a free city which embraces all Berlin—the Communist East no less than the free western segment of that metropolis. Let this whole city be held in trust and in peace by some international authority until such time as it is again the capital of Germany. Let the routes of access to this whole city be garrisoned by international peace teams in the effective pattern of those now operating between Israel and the Arab States. Let this interim status of free city be guaranteed by the NATO and Warsaw-pact countries.

Let Bonn and Pankow subscribe to this arrangement and pay its costs in appropriate shares. Let these changes be incorporated in specific written agreements. Then, perhaps, we may have the beginning of a durable peace in Berlin and the healing of the cleavage in Germany and Europe.

I know, Madam President, that to bring about this change in Berlin after the division of that city has hardened over many years may seem an immensely difficult, political, and diplomatic undertaking. But is it not, really, an infinitesimal task when compared with the full implications of an essay in military solution with what comes after it?

I realize, too, Madam President, that this approach may evoke no response from Mr. Khrushchev. But do Mr. Khrushchev's reactions, whatever they may be, dissolve us from our rational responsibilities to ourselves and to the world in this situation? Do not those responsibilities require us to explore fully and vigorously any and all avenues of peace even as we steel ourselves for what must come if the way to peace cannot be found?

I make these suggestions, Madam President, as one Senator from the State of Montana, and I make them on my own responsibility. I make them in full recognition of the present position of this Government which, if it is unchanged will be my personal position when all the words are exhausted. I make them, however, in the belief that this present position is not enough, even as the present Soviet position is not enough. Our present position on Berlin, even unchallenged by the Soviet Union, leads only in a circle endlessly repeated as it continues to recede from the changing realities of Germany and Europe, until it now promises to become at best irrelevant and at worst a stimulus to catastrophe. The Soviet position on Berlin, unchanged, in my opinion, is also headed toward complete irrelevance unless before that point is reached, it precipitates a military conflict by accident or design.

The implications of what I have tried to say to the Senate, then, are clear. Sooner or later, the Western nations and the Soviet Union must seek a new way, a third way, to solution of the Berlin problem along the lines which I have suggested or some other. Unless this search is pursued with energy and dispatch and to fruition, sooner or later

Berlin is likely to become the pivot of a new disaster for mankind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXPEDITION OF UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

#### "PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES

##### "Declaration of purpose

"Sec. 390. The purpose of this part is—

"(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and develop programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

##### "Authorization of appropriations

"Sec. 391. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until July 1, 1967, for payment of grants with respect to which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1966.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding \$25,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications approved under section 393, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1967.

##### "Grants for surveys

"Sec. 392. (a) An application by the State educational television agency of a State for a grant for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall be approved by the Commissioner if the Governor of such State, or the legislature of such State by a duly adopted resolution, certifies to the Commissioner with respect to such application—

"(1) that any grant made to such State by the United States for carrying out the

purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 will be matched by an equal amount of State funds; and

"(2) that such grant and such State funds will be used exclusively for making a survey of the need for any utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities, and for the development of a program by the State educational television agency, for the construction of such facilities, which is based on such survey.

"(b) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of section 391 the Commissioner shall pay to each State which has an application approved under this section an amount equal to one-half of its expenditures during such year in carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390; except that the total paid to any State under this section may not exceed \$10,000. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage area or regional surveys, and development of appropriate construction programs, for areas including any part or parts of more than one State and for such purposes he shall modify the requirements of subsection (a) to the extent he deems necessary to permit and facilitate financial and other cooperation between the State educational television agencies of the States involved.

##### "Grants for construction

"Sec. 393. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Commissioner an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit organization consisting solely of entities referred to in the preceding clauses of this paragraph and which is organized solely to engage in educational television broadcasting;

"(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

"(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

"(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) That total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed \$1,000,000.

"(c) In the case of any State with respect to which an application has been approved under section 392, an application for a grant under this section for a project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities in such State shall be submitted through the State educational television agency of such State; and in such case the Commissioner shall not approve such application under this section unless such agency concurs in or approves such application and, if a State construction program has been developed as provided in subsection (a) (2) of

section 392, certifies that such facilities are included in, or construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadest educational uses.

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Commissioner shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Commissioner shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

"(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, or organization described in subsection (a) (1), or

"(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

##### "Records

"Sec. 394. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

*"Definitions"*

"Sec. 395. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term 'construction', as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting, including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs, but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term 'State educational television agency' means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term 'Governor' means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term 'nonprofit community educational television organization' means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"(6) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

*"Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission"*

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of such Commission.

*"Rules and regulations"*

"Sec. 397. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 393 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

*"Federal interference or control prohibited"*

"Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of tele-

vision broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the bill, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey the conferees on the part of the Senate.

*NO "TINCUP" FOR US*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Thursday, the House of Representatives passed a bill to reimburse the New York City police force for extraordinary expenses incurred guarding Khrushchev and Castro in 1960 at the United Nations. As the sponsor of a companion Senate bill, I am delighted that this legislation has passed its first test and I look forward to its consideration in the Senate.

The House bill appropriates \$3,063,500 to the city of New York, representing reimbursement at straight time rates for overtime hours put in by members of the New York City police force during the period of the opening of the 15th General Assembly.

Total cost to the city of New York of this special U.N. service was approximately \$6.5 million, which included overtime pay, clerical, and administrative services and the cost of vehicles and other special precautions. The amount approved by the House would only cover costs which can clearly and without any question be considered as beyond regular operating costs of the city of New York police force.

Mr. President, money cannot repay the policemen of New York for the superb manner in which they carried out their duties at the convening of the 15th General Assembly. They lived up to their reputation as New York's finest. Many members of the force were away from their homes and families for long hours, day and night. They did an outstanding job in averting the unpleasant incidents ordinarily associated with the presence of so many unpopular Communist leaders. Their efforts constitute a service, not only to the city of New York, but to the Nation as a whole.

True, a share of the responsibility of protecting delegates and visitors to the United Nations rests with the city. The city wanted the United Nations located at Lake Success and derives benefit from its presence there. However, the special and unforeseeable circumstances of 1960 surpassed the city's obligation. Therefore the responsibility must be shared by the Nation as a whole, acting in its capacity as leader of the free world and host country to the United Nations.

Mr. President, this legislation is and has been a completely nonpartisan effort. The principle involved has re-

ceived the blessing of former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. Bills to reimburse the city of New York have been introduced in the other body by Congressmen RYAN, CELLER, HALPERN, LINDSAY, and Congresswoman KELLY. I introduced the companion measure in the Senate with the active support and cosponsorship of my distinguished senior colleague from New York, Senator JAVITS.

Mr. President, following the introduction of this bill I was in close touch with the Department of State, which has written to me as follows:

There is no doubt that the additional cost of police services imposed upon the city of New York was unprecedented and unforeseen and, for that reason, it would be inappropriate to expect the city to bear this expense in its entirety.

Many will recall the tremendous concern prevailing at the time of Khrushchev's visit to New York. An incident occurring at that time could inflame and aggravate world tensions and create international havoc.

When Castro arrived at Idlewild Airport the New York Times reported that his cavalcade was led by a motorcycle and a car containing three officers with submachine guns. Two policemen flanked his car, a bus with 60 policemen followed and four patrolmen were stationed at each bridge along the route. Two hundred policemen were waiting at his hotel when he arrived. This is not routine police protection. The average diplomatic visitor to the city of New York, even a head of state does not receive or require such heavy protective efforts.

Mr. President, when this measure was debated in the House one of its opponents said that the torch held by the Statue of Liberty should henceforth be represented by a "tincup" if this bill was enacted. His analogy is completely inaccurate. To portray the financial relationship between New York State and the Federal Government, it would be more appropriate to replace the torch with a check book and a fountain pen. We have been paying Uncle Sam's bills for activities which do not benefit New York for years.

In 1959, for example, 8.3 percent of the Federal taxes paid by New Yorkers were returned to New York State in the form of Federal payments to State and local governments. The gentleman who made the "tincup" statement comes from a State which received twice as much, 15.2 percent. In 1959 Wyoming received 32.3 percent, New Mexico 27.3 percent, and the only State with a percentage lower than that of New York was New Jersey, with 6.4 percent. We do not hold a "tincup." We never have. It is about time New York State got a fair shake from the Federal Government, and that is all we ask.

Consider the contingents which descended on New York City in September and October of 1960—Khrushchev, Tito, Gomulka, Castro, and Kadar. This was shortly after the U-2 and RB-47 incidents. Relations were strained. The temperature of the cold war was rising steadily. The job of protecting these

"two-bit" dictators, many people believed, was impossible. Nevertheless, the police force of New York City did the job and did it well. We owe them a real debt of gratitude, for an incident during those visits might have been catastrophic. The amount requested in the legislation which has passed the House and which I have introduced in the Senate is reasonable and fair. I urge the Senate to give its immediate attention and favorable action. -

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 9, 1962:

##### OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Justice M. Chambers, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Edward A. McDermott.

##### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. (New position.)

##### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Jalmer O. Brown	William B. Durham
James Cavahaugh	Hamlett I. Allen
Rodman W. Vaughan	Theron H. Gato
Arnold J. Larsen	Charles F. W. Cullison
Frederick B. Thatcher	

The following-named person to be lieutenant commander in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Alvin J. Boxwell

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Clement H. E. Kerans, Jr.

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Harry Andrew Allen	Joseph Henry Sanford
John Knight Andrews	Lawrence Michael Schilling
George Eddings Archer, Jr.	Michael Joseph Schiro
William Leon Avery	John Callup Schmidtmann
Albert Frank Baker	Richard Eugene Shrum
Clifford Eugene Banner	Frederick Damien Smith
Robert Andrew Bastek	Joseph James Smith
Peter Michael Bernstein	Thomas David Smith
Raymond Demetrius Bland	Anthony John Soltys
Richard Carl Blaschke	Theodore Arthur Some
Robert Kent Blaschke	Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
Thomas Walter Boerger	William Harry Spence
Harold Lance Bonnet	Wayne Paul Stevens
William Andrew Borchers	Hugh Lafayette Thomas, Jr.
David Thomas Boyle	Henry Bradley Traver
Robert Frederick Boysen, Jr.	James Alexander Umberger
John Wentworth Brittain	Joseph Louis Valenti
Larry Dennis Brooks	Harvey Landin Wahnquist, Jr.
Phillip Jeffrey Bull	James Lee Walker
Carl Henry Burkhardt	William James Wallace, Jr.
David Kevin Carey	Thomas William Watkins III
Louis Michael Casale	Thomas Samuel Whipple
George Anthony Caskmir	Daniel Michael White
David Raynor Coady	Jack Warwick Whiting, Jr.
Walter Melbourne Coburn	David Hart Whitten
Richard Vincent Consigli	David Harold Withers
Joseph Lawrence Crowe, Jr.	John Anthony Wuestneck
Laurence Joseph Dallaire, Jr.	Ronald Charles Zinzer
John George Denninger, Jr.	
Joseph Patrick Dibella	
Joseph Henry Discenza	

Lance Arthur Eagan  
Joseph Robert Finelli  
Arthur Richard Gandt  
David Shaw Gemmell  
James Franklin Greene, Jr.  
Richmond Dean Greenough, Jr.  
William Scott Haight  
Glenn Edgar Haines  
David Wade Hastings  
William Colbert Heming  
Arthur Eugene Henn  
Peter Christian Hennings  
Stephen Henry Hines  
Eugene Hornstein  
Raymond Jerry Houttekier  
Kwang-Ping Hsu  
Norman Henry Huff  
Herbert Miller Hurst  
Harry Nelson Hutchins III  
Thomas Patrick Keane  
Don Michael Keehn  
Thomas Joseph Kenney  
Frederick Arthur Kelley  
Richard Joseph Klessel  
Daniel Tobias Koenig  
James Henry Lightner  
Thomas Henry Lloyd, Jr.  
Neal Mahan  
Robert David Markoff  
George Edward Mason  
John Thomas Mason  
John Michael McCann  
Robert Edward McDonough, Jr.  
James Charles McElroy  
Thomas Peter McGann  
Thomas Francis McGrath III  
James Andrew McIntosh  
Alexander Clark McKean, Jr.  
Timothy George McKinna  
Arthur William Mergner, Jr.  
Wade Mulford Moncrief, Jr.  
Francis William Mooney  
Charles Wesley Morgan  
Stewart Brandhorst Morgan  
James Lowell Mueller  
William Stewart Murray  
Michael Owen Murtagh  
Peter Thomas Muth  
Richard Brien O'Keefe  
Leonard Joseph Pichini  
Ronald Martin Potter  
David William Proudfoot  
David William Robinette  
Edward Kenneth Roe, Jr.  
Allen Edward Rolland  
William Henry Roth  
Jon Patrick Ryan  
Joseph Henry Sanford  
Lawrence Michael Schilling  
Michael Joseph Schiro  
John Callup Schmidtmann  
Richard Eugene Shrum  
Frederick Damien Smith  
Joseph James Smith  
Thomas David Smith  
Anthony John Soltys  
Theodore Arthur Some  
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.  
William Harry Spence  
Wayne Paul Stevens  
Hugh Lafayette Thomas, Jr.  
Henry Bradley Traver  
James Alexander Umberger  
Joseph Louis Valenti  
Harvey Landin Wahnquist, Jr.  
James Lee Walker  
William James Wallace, Jr.  
Thomas William Watkins III  
Thomas Samuel Whipple  
Daniel Michael White  
Jack Warwick Whiting, Jr.  
David Hart Whitten  
David Harold Withers  
John Anthony Wuestneck  
Ronald Charles Zinzer

The following-named person to be chief warrant officer, W-4, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Joseph A. Nartonis

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officer, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard D. Borden  
Marian H. Murphy  
Louis DeBernardi, Jr.

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John F. Archer, of California.  
Richard C. Barkley, of Michigan.  
Robert L. Barry, of Pennsylvania.  
Natale H. Bellocchi, of New York.  
Norman M. Bouton, of Indiana.  
A. Donald Bramante, of Virginia.  
John R. Countryman, of New York.  
Miss Marie R. de Gunzburg, of New York.  
Eugene Kelekenov, of Massachusetts.  
James E. Leader, of Delaware.  
William K. Mackey, of the District of Columbia.  
Andrew J. Pierre, of New York.  
Gilbert F. Rankin, of California.  
Frederick S. Vaznaugh, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Michael J. Barry, of New York.  
William W. Beyer, of New Jersey.  
Richard A. Christensen, of Wisconsin.  
John R. Davis, of New York.  
Peter Jon de Vos, of the District of Columbia.  
Charles F. Dunbar, Jr., of the District of Columbia.  
Henry A. Engelbrecht, Jr., of Maryland.  
Ronald D. Flack, of Minnesota.  
Carmen L. Gentile, of Massachusetts.  
John L. Gibson, of Iowa.  
Miss Dixie L. Harrington, of Iowa.  
Miss Ruth M. Held, of New York.  
M. Charles Hill, of New Jersey.  
Miss Carolyn M. Kruschke, of Minnesota.  
Edward A. Mainland, of California.  
Paul M. Meo, of Massachusetts.  
Robert P. Myers, Jr., of California.  
Thomas M. T. Niles, of Kentucky.  
Ernest D. Oates, of California.  
Arthur M. Odum, of Texas.  
Walter E. Stadler, of New York.  
Carl Taylor, of Vermont.  
Joel D. Ticknor, of New York.  
Thaddeus C. Trzyna, of California.  
Frank Tumminia, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Gilbert F. Austin, of Washington.  
John H. Backer, of North Carolina.  
James P. Burke, of Maryland.  
James D. Conley, of Indiana.  
Robert M. Gilkey, Jr., of the District of Columbia.  
Benjamin H. Jackson, Jr., of Rhode Island.  
William A. K. Jones, of the District of Columbia.  
Barry R. Nemcoff, of Pennsylvania.  
Robert L. Nichols, of New Hampshire.  
Ralph G. Seehafer, of Virginia.